

9 September 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: General: NPIC Photographic Laboratory Branch
Specific: Interpretation of Agency Regulations on Payment
of Night Differential in Conjunction with
Payment of Overtime

25X1 1. On 9 September 1966 I called [] Chief,
25X1 Vouchered Payroll Branch, Compensation and Tax Division, Office of
Finance. [] had been identified to me by the budget and
fiscal officer of NPIC as the "authority" to whom NPIC referred its
questions concerning payment of night differential.

25X1 2. I asked [] how he interpreted the provision of
25X1 [] that pertains to payment of night differential in
conjunction with payment for overtime. He said that night differ-
ential could be paid if the employee was required to work overtime
into another shift because someone on the second shift failed to
report for duty. He also said that the Office of Finance did not
question T&A certifications on entitlements to night differential
pay. When I read to him the precise wording of [], he
25X1 backtracked and said that night differential could be paid in
conjunction with overtime when the employee was working on "another
regularly scheduled" shift. He said there was no requirement that
the employee working overtime be replacing someone on the other
shift. I asked if there was anything in writing on this point.
He said he would check and call me later. He said that his office
relied almost exclusively on the interpretations appearing in the
GAO's Civilian Pay Manual.

25X1 3. [] called later in the afternoon and said that
25X1 he knew of no written guidance to T&A clerks supplementing []
25X1 He also commented that the wording of [] was unusually pre-
cise and that the example given should clarify any doubts. I then
asked if it were not rather widely believed within the Agency that
an employee working overtime on another shift had to be replacing
someone in order to be paid night differential. He said that he
thought that this might very well be a common belief. I did not
remind him of the fact that this was precisely the interpretation
he gave me--until I took issue with him.

25X1 []